



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/814,303	03/21/2001	Garth F. Schmeling	10002015-1	4824

7590

09/08/2005

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

BILGRAMI, ASGHAR H

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2143

DATE MAILED: 09/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/814,303

Applicant(s)

SCHMELING, GARTH F.

Examiner

Asghar Bilgrami

Art Unit

2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 May 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 March 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit: 2143

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 2, 4-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hattori (U.S. 6,094,674) and Bendinelli (U.S. 6,061,719).

3. As per claim 1, 15 & 24 Hattori disclosed a confederacy comprising: a network; a plurality of devices coupled via said network, at least one of said devices having a resource (col.3, lines 36-64); and means for automatically effecting communication with respect to said resource between said device having said resource and at least one other of said devices coupled via said network (col.3, lines 25-35 & col.10, lines 4-16) and a central access device for allowing an administrator to remotely manage the plurality of devices connected to the network without requiring individual physical access of each device to browse the web content therein (col.2, lines 3-6 & col.3, lines 36-64). In the same field of endeavor Hattori did not explicitly disclose wherein said resource is embedded web content. However Bendinelli disclosed wherein said resource is embedded web content (col.1, lines 45-67, col.2, lines 1-5, col.2, lines 51-67 & col.3, line12).

Art Unit: 2143

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time this invention was made to have incorporated web content as taught by Bendinelli to be available to the networked devices having a central access managing device as taught by Hattori in order to give administrators more control & users more versatility, added features and as a result enrich their network browsing experience.

4. As per claims 2 & 16 Hattori- Bendinelli disclosed the invention of Claim 1 wherein said network is an intranet (Hattori, col.19, lines 38-42).

5. As per claims 4, 5, 6, 7 & 17 Hattori-Bendinelli disclosed means for automatically effecting communication being an agent residing on at least one of said devices (col.2, lines 59-61); wherein said agent resides on said device having said resource; further including an agent running on each device on said network; wherein each agent running on each of said devices on said network is implemented in software (Hattori, col.6, lines 1-6 & col.10, lines 4-16).

6. As per claims 8, 9 & 18 Hattori-Bendinelli disclosed the invention of Claim 7 wherein said agents include code for establishing and joining the said confederacy (Hattori, col.13, lines 5-10 & col.14, lines 50-59).

7. As per claims 11 & 20 Hattori-Bendinelli disclosed the invention of Claim 8 wherein at least one device includes memory for caching an object value from a device in said confederacy (Hattori, col.12, 36-45).

Art Unit: 2143

8. As per claims 12 & 21 Hattori-Bendinelli disclosed the invention of Claim 8 wherein at least one of said agents includes code for allowing each member to act as a portal (Hattori, col.13, lines 22-31).

9. As per claims 13 & 22 Hattori-Bendinelli disclosed the invention of Claim 8 wherein said agents include code for monitoring changes at said other devices in said confederacy (Hattori, col.6, lines 1-14).

10. As per claims 14 & 23 Hattori-Bendinelli disclosed the invention of Claim 8 wherein said agent includes code for verifying that a member device is active and in the confederacy (Hattori, col.6, lines 15-22).

### *Response to Arguments*

11. Applicant's arguments filed 05/23/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

12. The applicant argued that "none of the cited references, in combination or alone, disclose the applicants central access device for allowing an administrator to remotely manage the plurality of devices connected to the network without requiring individual physical access of each device to browse the web content therein".

13. As to applicant arguments Hittori discloses an information processing system (central access device) in which information of functions and processes is registered which performs the control operation (administration) for each user (col.3, lines 36-64).

Art Unit: 2143

14. The applicant argued that Hittori require an user to manage their individual client machine and not an administrator, like the applicant's claimed invention.

15. As to applicants arguments please refer to examiner's comments on line 13.

### *Conclusion*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Asghar Bilgrami whose telephone number is 571-272-3907. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:00-5:00PM.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wiley can be reached on 571-272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



AB

Asghar Bilgrami  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2143



DAVID WILEY  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100